



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,823	11/17/2003	Claire Svetlana Vishik	1033-T00468	2178
60533	7590	08/15/2007	EXAMINER	
TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP 8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE SUITE A201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			BAIRD, EDWARD J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/714,823

Applicant(s)

VISHIK, CLAIRE SVETLANA

Examiner

Ed Baird

Art Unit

3609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/20/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3609

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, and 103.

Specification

1. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 3, 14, and 25 recite the limitation "the XML representation". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 12, 15-20, 22, 23, 26-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Gonen-Friedmann et al (US Pub No. 2001/0047332 A1).
6. Regarding claim 1, Gonen-Friedmann teaches a method comprising:

Art Unit: 3609

- providing a line-by-line user interface to enable a user to question individual line items in a transaction,

Gonen-Friedmann discloses "A computer-implemented and Internet-based method of managing Accounts Receivable (AR) information includes steps of receiving a customer request for remote Internet access to AR information (such as pending invoices) owned by vendor" [Abstract]. Gonen-Friedmann further discloses "The present invention is also a computer-implemented and Internet-based method of **disputing** an invoice from a vendor to a customer, comprising the steps of accessing a database record corresponding to the invoice to be disputed over a Web site of the vendor;" [paragraph 0014]. Gonen-Friedmann further discloses "if a customer 302, 304, 306 wishes to dispute an invoice and/or an account (step S1), he or she may be prompted to select one of a plurality of predefined reason codes, as shown in step S2a. The plurality of predefined reason codes may include codes for disputing freight charges, as shown at S2a1, disputing taxes applied as shown at S2a2, disputing a specific invoice line, as shown at S2a3 or disputing a duplicate invoice, as shown at S2a4, for example" [paragraph 0037]. Examiner interprets disputing a specific invoice line as the Applicant's questioning individual line items in a transaction.

Gonen-Friedmann does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the user interface provides multiple links to multiple destinations for multiple question types per line item to facilitate routing a user request to an appropriate destination based on its question type.

However, Gonen-Friedmann discloses "Other common customer requests and questions include requests for an account balance, inquiries related to payments being applied to invoices, requests for amounts past due, inquiries asking whether all credits

Art Unit: 3609

have been applied to the proper account, for example" [paragraph 0005]. Gonen-Friedmann further discloses "selecting a reason code for the dispute and at least a disputed amount; validating a Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and the disputed amount to create a pending Credit Memo Request, and causing the Credit Memo Request to be processed through a workflow engine to send and route the Credit Memo Request through at least one of a selected process for the selected reason code,," [paragraph 0018].

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Gonen-Friedmann's disclosure to use multiple links to multiple destinations for multiple question types (disputes) because "reason codes" could be used for routing a user request for information as well as for routing Credit Memo Requests.

Traditionally, customers would "manage" such disputes indirectly. They would call customer service and verbally explain the nature of the inquiry or dispute. Such waste of time and resources could be diminished by such a method allowing self-service access to a customer's account.

7. **Claim 4** is not substantially different from claim 1 wherein multiple links used for questioning and disputing items as specified in claim 4 is also inherent in claim 1.

Therefore claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

8. Regarding **claim 5**, Gonen-Friedmann teaches the use of multiple links to correct information (second link to correct line item). Gonen-Friedmann discloses: "The validating step may include a step of submitting the Credit Memo Request if the Credit Memo Request is correct and may include the step of correcting the Credit Memo Request if any information appearing thereon is incorrect", [paragraph 0015].

9. Regarding **claim 6 and 7**, Gonen-Friedmann does not disclose a first link questioning the amount of a service associated with a line item (claim 6), or the amount

Art Unit: 3609

of time associated with a line item (claim 7), and a second link to with a billing rate (claim 6).

However, Gonen-Friedmann discloses: "The reasons for disputing a bill are many, and include such reasons as returned items, no credit given for a returned item, invalid amounts, invalid taxes, freight, duplicate invoice, incorrect freight charges, and the like", [paragraph 0036]. Examiner interprets amounts as being the amount of service (claim 6) or the amount of billing (claim 6), or amount of time (claim 7).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Gonen-Friedmann's disclosure to use links associated with amount of service and amount of billing of line items because it allows a user to resolve billing issues related to disputed quantity of services.

10. Regarding **claim 8**, Gonen-Friedmann teaches using electronic mail addresses as the multiple of links. Gonen-Friedmann discloses: "Such a selected . . . personnel may include, for example, the collector assigned to that account and/or the sales person listed on the disputed invoice. Such a notification may include an email to the collector and/or to other selected persons within vendor's organization and/or an entry in an internally accessible Web notification page", [paragraph 0041]. Examiner interprets email as that which requires electronic mail addresses in this claim.

11. Regarding **claim 9**, Gonen-Friedmann teaches an online form to receive user-entered text to direct to a user-selected link. Gonen-Friedmann discloses: "Upon being properly authenticated, the customer 120 may be sent to an "Account Details" Web page. The Account Details Web page 200, shown at FIG. 2, allows the customer to view, in a tabular format, all of his or her outstanding invoices, account balances, etc. The information displayed in the Accounts Details page is particular to the logged-on customer only", [paragraph 0028 and Figure 2]. Examiner interprets a logged-on

Art Unit: 3609

customer being online. Figure 2 is a representation of an online display page which accepts user-entered text. Figure 2 also shows sample user-selected links such as transactions, status, date, purchase order, sales order, original amount and remaining amount.

12. Regarding **claim 11**, Gonen-Friedmann teaches a method with a user interface which is integrated with a workflow to enable a maintainer to edit, amend and extend a process of routing user requests. Gonen-Friedmann discloses a workflow engine which: "may further be configured to send a notification upon approval or rejection of the pending Credit Memo Request, the disputed amount being automatically credited to the disputed invoice when the pending Credit Memo Request is approved. The Web site may also allow the customer to add explanatory comments to a blank field, to enable the selected hierarchy of persons empowered to approve the validated Credit Memo Request and the primary approver for the selected reason code to process the Credit Memo Request when the selected reason code does not fit a reason for requesting the Credit Memo Request. The Web site may also enable the submission of the Credit Memo Request if the Credit Memo Request is correct and the correction of the Credit Memo Request if any information therein is incorrect. The reason codes, process, hierarchy and primary approver may be predefined by the vendor. The Web site may further be configured to authenticate a customer before allowing the customer to access the invoice", [paragraph 0019]. Examiner interprets the selected hierarchy of persons to be the Applicant's maintainer who may edit, amend and extend a process of routing user requests.

13. **Claims 12, 15-20, and 22** describe systems which are parallel to the methods described in claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively. In turn, claims 12, 15-20, and 22 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively.

Art Unit: 3609

14. Claims 23, 26-31, and 33 describe articles (i.e. computer-readable mediums), which are parallel to the methods described claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively. In turn, claims 23, 26-31, and 33 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4-9, and 11, respectively.

15. Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Gonen-Friedmann et al** (US Pub No. 2001/0047332 A1) in view of **Zimmer et al** (US Pub No. 2003/ 0051226 A1).

16. Regarding claim 2, **Gonen-Friedmann** does not teach processing eXtensible Markup Language (XML) using tags within which multiple links per line item are defined.

However, Zimmer teaches a system and method of translating an abstract notation of an application to a series of sub-applications which uses XML tags for referencing data in different reports. Zimmer discloses: "The example XML above represents Report entities are defined in the XML descriptions 38. Multiple reports that use similar layout and presentation properties can reference an external XML file to handle these similarities The <center> tag is used to center align data. Lines 08 through 10 highlight our ability to use Intelligent Variables (IVars) in our reports. IVars can be used by queries to retrieve data from the database 20a,b for the purpose of generating reports", [paragraph 0074].

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Gonen-Friedmann's disclosure to use Zimmer's XML tags so that a user can share data between different databases.

17. Regarding **claim 3**, Zimmer teaches use of XML representation to identify a source database as described in rejection of claim 2. Therefore, claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

18. **Claims 13 and 14** describe systems which are parallel to the methods described in claims 2 and 3, respectively. In turn, claims 13 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 3, respectively.

19. **Claims 24 and 25** describe articles (i.e. computer-readable mediums), which are parallel to the methods described claims 2 and 3, respectively. In turn, claims 25 and 25 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 3, respectively.

20. Claims 10, 21, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Gonen-Friedmann et al** (US Pub No. 2001/0047332 A1) in view of **Nielsen** (US Patent No. US 5,948,054).

21. Regarding **claim 10**, Gonen-Friedmann teaches a link that facilitates machine-to-machine communication to address one question type without requiring human intervention as discussed in the rejection of claim 9 above. Gonen-Friedmann does not disclose a link that facilitates communication with a human to address another question type.

However, Nielsen teaches a method and system for facilitating the exchange of information between human users in a computer network. Nielsen discloses: "In a networked computer system including a customer computer associated with a human customer, one or more consultant computers associated with one or more human consultants, and a server computer, the human customer sends an information request to the server via the customer computer. The request, which includes a question that the customer wishes to have answered, does not specify a consultant from which the

answer may be obtained. In response, the server determines which one or ones of the consultants is qualified to provide the requested information. The server then solicits the requested information from one or more of the qualified consultants. If at least one of the qualified consultants decides to provide the requested information, then the server receives the information from the consultant via one of the consultant computers.

Thereafter, the server sends the information to the customer via the customer computer. In this manner, the server matches the human customer with the question with a human consultant with the answer", [Abstract].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Gonen-Friedmann's disclosure to use a link that facilitates communication with a human to address another question type so that questions and inquiries that may require more explanation or details may be discussed with a consultant that has more extensive knowledge of a company's business processes.

22. **Claims 21 and 32** describe a system and an article (i.e. computer-readable medium) respectively, which are parallel to the method described in claim 10. In turn, claims 21 and 32 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

Cited Prior Art

23. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Fisher, et al: "Persistent Dynamic Payment", (USPub. No. 2003/0126094 A1); Ginzboorg, et al: "Implementation of Access Service", (US Patent No. 6,240,091 B1); "Re-Engineered Business Processes From 170 Systems and Oracle's iProcurement 5.0 Streamline Procurement/ Disbursement Operations at the University of Pennsylvania", PR Newswire, New York, Apr 29, 2002, pg 1. Shutovich, "Free-up time,

money through e-connectivity", Aftermath Business, Cleveland, Jul 2001, Vol. 111, Iss. 7, pg S2 (5 pages).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ed Baird whose telephone number is (571) 270-3330. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 am - 5:00 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Akm Ullah can be reached on (571) 272-2361. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ed Baird
Assistant Patent Examiner
571-270-3330


AKM ULLAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER